

REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 6-10, 15-19, 28, 34-37, 42-46, 55, 58, 60-82, 85, and 87-107. Claims 1, 4, 6-28, 31, 33-55, 58, 60-82, and 87-107 are pending in this application.

Applicants amend claims 1, 28, 55, and 82 to more appropriately define the claimed subject matter and to correct informalities. Applicants also amend claims 6-10, 15-19, 34-37, 42-46, 58, 60-81, 85, and 87-107 to correct informalities. These amendments do not add any new subject matter.

§112, Second Paragraph, Rejection of Claims 1, 28, 55, and 82

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 28, 55, and 82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite, alleging, “[t]he exact scope of the claim is not clear because Kiso and K’iso are not clearly defined so as to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. ... In the present situation one cannot exactly ascertain what must be read into the terms ‘Kiso’ and ‘K’iso’.” (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2.)

Claims 1, 28, 55, and 82, as amended, do not recite the terms “Kiso” or “K’iso.” Thus, this rejection is obviated.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1, 55, and 82 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite, stating that these claims “recite the limitations ‘another information processing apparatus,’ ‘the other information processing apparatus,’ and ‘the apparatus’ throughout the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.” (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 3, to page 3, paragraph 1.) Claims 1, 55, and 82 are being amended to have proper antecedent basis.

Claims 1, 55, and 82, as amended, have proper antecedent basis in regard to the recited information processing apparatuses. Thus, this rejection is obviated.

§102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6-28, 31, 33-55, 58, 60-82, 85, and 87-107 over

Traw et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6-28, 31, 33-55, 58, 60-82, 85, and 87-107 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,542,610 to Traw et al. ("*Traw et al.*"). To properly anticipate Applicant's claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Traw et al. fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 1, from which claims 4 and 6-27 depend. For example, *Traw et al.* fails to disclose an information processing system wherein, inter alia, "the encrypted data is encrypted using an encryption key, the encryption key being formed based on a first random number generated by the first information processing apparatus and a second random number generated by the second information processing apparatus, and then transmitted in the isochronous transmission mode via the interface," as recited in amended claim 1.

Instead, *Traw et al.* teaches a "method for protecting digital content from copying and/or other misuse as it is transferred between one or more computationally constrained devices over insecure links" (Abstract). The method includes establishing an encrypted control channel to preserve confidentiality of content channel keys (Col. 9, lines 53-59.) The "source of the content" sends a content channel key that is "a

randomly generated key which is unique for each stream of content (K_{Content})” (Col. 9, lines 59-64).

However, the “randomly generated key” of *Traw et al.* is not “formed based on a first random number generated by [a] first information processing apparatus and a second random number generated by [a] second information processing apparatus,” as required by claim 1. Thus, claim 1 and claims 4 and 6-27 that depend therefrom are allowable over *Traw et al.*

Claims 28, 55, and 82 should be allowed over *Traw et al.* under §102(e) for reasons substantially similar to those explained above. *Traw et al.* fails to teach an “encryption key being formed based on a first random number generated by the first information processing apparatus and a second random number generated by the second information processing apparatus,” as recited in claims 28, 55, and 82. Thus, claims 28, 55, and 82, and claims 31, 33-54, 58, 60-81, 85, and 87-107 dependent therefrom, should also be allowed over *Traw et al.*

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 9, 2006

By: _____



Reece Nienstadt
Reg. No. 52,072